

REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed October 15, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response that expires January 15, 2005. The Examiner continues to reject all of the pending claims using the same arguments as previously provided in the Office Action dated January 9, 2004. In our previous response mailed April 9, 2004, the applicants provided detailed arguments as to why several noted features are not described, taught or suggested by the cited references, even in combined. In response to these repeated arguments, the Examiner repeatedly states in the various Office Actions because he suggests that Perkins discloses "an IP address [that] includes the location address identifying an access link termination node for which a user has carried out location registration and a user identifier which identifies the user (*please see reference*)" (emphasis added).

The prosecution of this patent application has remained stagnant at this stage for some time, with the applicants arguing that these elements are not described or suggested by the references, and with the Examiner stating that they are. In response to the Applicants' detailed arguments as to why the elements are not taught by the references, the Examiner only repeatedly refers the Applicants to the reference generally, while providing no guidance as to what elements or passages the Examiner is referring to. After much detailed review of the references, the Applicants have been unable to find any teaching of these elements of the claim, and respectfully request the assistance of the Examiner in identifying the elements that the Examiner believes are the same as the claim elements at issue, so as to move forward with this prosecution in an appropriate manner.

The Applicants' respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show that the references (either singly or in combination) described, teach or suggest these claim elements at

issue. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to show that the references (either singly or in combination) describe all of the elements of the claims. Therefore, the Examiner's burden of proving a *prima facie* case of anticipation and obviousness, have not been met, and withdrawal of the rejections is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 13th day of January, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds
DS0000002991V001